



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,494	08/16/2001	Reid W. Von Borstel	1331-352	1560

23117 7590 07/26/2005

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

LEWIS, PATRICK T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1623

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/930,494	VON BORSTEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick T. Lewis	1623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 18-41 and 47-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 18-41 and 47-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>063022005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 30, 2005 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on July 21, 2003 is acknowledged.

3. Claims 16-17, 42-46 and 50 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on October 21, 2003.

Applicant's Response Dated June 30, 2005

4. In the Response filed June 30, 2005, claims 16-17, 42-46 and 50 were canceled. Claims 1-15, 18-41 and 47-49 are pending. An action on the merits of claims 1-15, 18-41 and 47-49 is contained herein below.

Art Unit: 1623

5. The provisional rejection of claims 1-15, 21, 23, 27, 31-32, 37-41, and 47 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 48-59 of copending Application No. 09/763,955 is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action dated November 3, 2004.

6. The rejection of claims 1-15, 18-32, and 47-49 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action dated November 3, 2004.

7. The rejection of claims 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action dated November 3, 2004.

8. The rejection of claims 1-15, 18-32, and 37-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 1997, Vol. 94, pages 11601-11606 (Page) in combination with von Borstel et al. US 6,316,426 (von Borstel) is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action dated November 3, 2004.

Rejections of Record Set Forth in the Office Action Dated November 3, 2004

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

10. Claims 1-15, 21, 23, 27, 31-32, 37-41, and 47 are provisionally rejected under obviousness-type double patenting as being the judicially created doctrine of unpatentable over claims 48-59 of copending Application No. 09/763,955. Although the claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Art Unit: 1623

Applicant has not set forth arguments traversing the instant rejection.

11. Claims 1-15, 18-32, and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the treatment of congenital mitochondrial disease, Alzheimer's Disease, Huntington's Disease, neuromuscular degenerative disease, and pathophysiological consequences of mitochondrial respiratory chain dysfunction, does not reasonably provide enablement for the prevention of congenital mitochondrial disease, Alzheimer's Disease, Huntington's Disease, neuromuscular degenerative disease, and pathophysiological consequences of mitochondrial respiratory chain dysfunction. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicant's arguments filed June 30, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the idea of prevention does not relate to preventing or reversing genetic defects but, rather, compensating for them to prevent full clinical manifestation of their disorder. Applicant has further cited references to support applicant's arguments.

The references provided by applicant have not been considered. If applicant wishes to have the references considered, said references should be properly cited on an information disclosure statement. Applicant should note that the references cited were published in 2003 (after the effective filing date of the instant disclosure). Whether the specification would have been enabling as of the filing date involves consideration of the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, and the level of skill in the art. The state of the art existing at the filing date of the application is used to determine whether a particular disclosure is enabling as of the filing date. Publications dated after the filing date providing information publicly first disclosed after the filing date generally cannot be used to show what was known at the time of filing. In general, if an applicant seeks to use a publication to prove the state of the art for the purpose of the enablement requirement, the publication must have been published (made available to the public) earlier than the effective filing date of the application.

During patent examination, the pending claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification. In the instant case, the specification does not provide a definition of "prevention". In the absence of an express intent to impart a novel meaning to the claim terms, the words are presumed to take on the ordinary and customary meanings attributed to them by those of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the disclosure is not enabled for the prevention of congenital mitochondrial disease, Alzheimer's

Art Unit: 1623

Disease, Huntington's Disease, neuromuscular degenerative disease, and pathophysiological consequences of mitochondrial respiratory chain dysfunction not because the term "prevention" is indefinite.

The specification does not provide sufficient support for applicant's claim that Alzheimer's Disease, Huntington's Disease, neuromuscular degenerative diseases, or pathophysiological consequences of mitochondrial respiratory chain dysfunction is prevented by the instant method. No data is presented in the instant disclosure correlating the administration of a pyrimidine nucleotide precursor with the prevention Alzheimer's Disease, Huntington's Disease, neuromuscular degenerative diseases, or pathophysiological consequences. The instant methods read upon the prevention of a vast number of conditions including pathophysiological consequences caused by aging, Parkinson's disease, muscular dystrophy, attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and migraines. Applicant further claims that the administration of pyrimidine nucleotide precursor prevents developmental delay in cognitive, motor, language, executive function and social skills. There are no teachings in the prior art that any of said conditions are prevented by the administration of a pyrimidine nucleotide precursor or any other pharmaceutical composition. Applicant's attention is directed to Bren "Alzheimer's: Searching for a Cure", FDA Consumer Magazine, July-August 2003 Issue, Pub No. FDA 04-1318C rev. (Bren). In the 2003 article, Bren discloses, "No cure or prevention for Alzheimer's disease exists yet...". Cattaneo et al. US 2005/0123922 A1 (Cattaneo) discloses, "At the moment there are no specific therapies available which can prevent symptoms or cure patients affected with Huntington's Disease." See

Art Unit: 1623

paragraph 0012. Not only does the art teach that many of the conditions are not preventable, the causes are not even known. For example, Bren teaches that researchers are not sure what cause Alzheimer's Disease (A Disease of the Brain). Hollander et al. Am J. Psychiatry (1999), Vol. 156:2, pages 317-320 (Hollander) teaches, "The etiology, pathophysiology, and genetic transmission of autism are not known, but autism may be best understood as a heterogeneous disorder resulting from multiple genetic and environmental factors, often complicated by neurologic, cytogenetic, neurotransmitter, and immunologic abnormalities."

12. Claims 1-15, 18-32, and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 1997, Vol. 94, pages 11601-11606 (Page) in combination with von Borstel et al. US 6,316,426 B1 (von Borstel).

Applicant's arguments filed June 30, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that overlapping symptoms are insufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, because it is well recognized that unrelated diseases can have overlapping symptoms.

In construing process claims and references, it is the identity of manipulative operations which leads to finding of obviousness. In the instant case, it does not appear that the claim language or limitations result in a manipulative difference in the method steps when compared to the prior art disclosure. Page teaches the treatment of patients described with a syndrome that included developmental delay, seizures, ataxia, recurrent infections, severe language deficit, and an unusual behavioral phenotype characterized by hyperactivity, short attention span, and poor social interaction with

Art Unit: 1623

uridine. Developmental delay, seizures, ataxia, recurrent infections, severe language deficit, and an unusual behavioral phenotype characterized by hyperactivity, short attention span, and poor social interaction are "pathophysiological consequences of mitochondrial respiratory chain dysfunction". The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. In the instant case, the prior art teaches the treatment of a population that is seen to overlap/embrace the population treated by the instant invention with uridine rendering the instantly claimed method prima facie obvious.

Conclusion

13. Claims 1-15, 18-41 and 47-49 are pending. Claims 1-15, 18-41 and 47-49 are rejected. No claims are allowed.


Art Unit: 1623

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick T. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-0655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10 am to 3 pm (Maxi Flex).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Patrick T. Lewis, PhD
Examiner
Art Unit 1623

ptl